

1 COOLEY LLP
2 Heidi Keefe (178960)
(hkeefe@cooley.com)
3 Lowell Mead (223989)
(lmead@cooley.com)
4 Dena Chen (286452)
(dchen@cooley.com)
5 Matthew J. Brigham (191428)
(mbrigham@cooley.com)
6 Priya B. Viswanath (238089)
(pviswanath@cooley.com)
7 3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, California 94304
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
8 Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

9 COOLEY LLP
10 Phillip Morton (*Pro Hac Vice*)
(pmorton@cooley.com)
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue
11 NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004-2400
12 Telephone: (202) 842-7800
Facsimile: (202) 842-7899

13 *Attorneys for Defendant*
14 Apple Inc.

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **SAN FRANCISO DIVISION**

18
19 COREPHOTONICS, LTD.

Case No. 3:17-cv-06457-JD (lead case)
Case No. 5:18-cv-02555-JD

20 Plaintiff,

**DEFENDANT'S SUPPORT FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**

21 vs.

22 APPLE INC.

23 Defendant.

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. 3:17-cv-06457-JD (lead case)
Case No. 5:18-cv-02555-JD

**DEF. SUPPORT FOR ADMIN
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

1 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Apple Inc. respectfully supports Plaintiff
 2 Corephotonics, Ltd.’s motion to file under seal (Dkt. 196) with respect to Apple confidential
 3 information.

4 **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

5 The Ninth Circuit treats dispositive versus non-dispositive motions (and documents
 6 attached thereto) differently for purposes of sealing. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*,
 7 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006); *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp.*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1098
 8 (9th Cir. 2016). Whereas dispositive motions are subject to the “compelling reason” standard,
 9 non-dispositive motions are subject to the “good cause” standard. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179-
 10 80 (detailing distinction between “compelling reason” and “good cause” standards as applied to
 11 dispositive and non-dispositive motions).

12 Courts in this District appear to be split on which standard applies to motions for leave to
 13 amend an answer or pleading. *E.g., DSS Tech. Mgmt. v. Apple*, No. 14-cv-05330-HSG, 2020
 14 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33050, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2020) (“[The] Court will apply the lower
 15 good cause standard for documents related . . . Apple’s motion for leave to file an amended
 16 answer.”); *Santelices v. Apttus*, No. 19-cv-07414-HSG, 2020 WL 5870509, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Oct.
 17 2, 2020) (“The Court will apply the lower good cause standard for the documents related to the
 18 motion for leave to amend [the complaint].”); *Real Action Paintball v. Advanced Tactical
 19 Ordnance Sys.*, No. 14-cv-02435-MEJ, 2015 WL 1534049, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2015)
 20 (“Furthermore, other courts have recognized that motions to amend pleadings are not dispositive
 21 for sealing purposes and thus the good cause standard generally applies.”); *but see Heath v.
 22 Google*, No. 15-cv-01824-BLF, 2017 WL 3530593, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2017) (“Courts
 23 also apply the compelling reasons standard in connection with a motion to amend the complaint
 24 and proposed complaint, because they involve central issues that are ‘more than tangentially
 25 related to the underlying cause of action.’” (citation omitted)); *Reyna v. ARRIS Int’l Plc*, No. 17-
 26 CV-01834-LHK, 2018 WL 1400513, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2018) (applying “compelling
 27 reason” standard where the party sought to seal “either an amended complaint or a motion for
 28 leave to file an amended complaint.”).

1 **II. ARGUMENT**

2 **A. Motion to File Under Seal Apple's Documents**

3 In an abundance of caution, Apple applies the “compelling reason” standard—but even
 4 under the “good cause” standard, the following materials should be sealed: (1) portions of
 5 Corephotonics’ Opposition to Apple Inc.’s Motion to Amend Answer (“Opposition” – Dkt. 196-
 6 3); (2) portions of Declaration of Brian D. Ledahl in Support of Corephotonics’ Opposition to
 7 Apple Inc.’s Motion to Amend Answer (“Ledahl Decl.” – Dkt. 196-4); and (3) Exhibit 1 to the
 8 Ledahl Decl. (“Ledahl Exh. 1” – Dkt. 196-5).

9 The Supreme Court has limited “the right to inspect and copy judicial records,”
 10 recognizing that “the common-law right of inspection has bowed before the power of a court to
 11 insure that its records are not used . . . as sources of business information that might harm a
 12 litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978).
 13 Similarly, the Ninth Circuit recognizes that the Federal Rules afford district courts “flexibility in
 14 balancing and protecting the interests of private parties.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180; *In re Elec. Arts*, 298 F. App’x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008) (granting petition for writ of mandamus and
 15 overturning the district court’s decision that terms of licensing agreement did not meet the
 16 “compelling reason” standard).

17 Courts in this District, including this Court, have found “compelling reasons . . . to
 18 seal . . . confidential terms of license agreements” *Ovonic Battery v. Sanyo Elec.*, No. 14-cv-
 19 01637-JD, 2014 WL 3749152, at *3 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2014); *Open Text S.A. v. Box*, No. 13-cv-
 20 04910-JD, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177484, at *18, *35, *48 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 26, 2014) (finding
 21 compelling reasons to seal agreements subject to third party confidentiality obligations, as well
 22 as sensitive licensing terms); *GoPro Hong Kong v. 2b Trading*, No. 16-cv-05113-JD, 2017 U.S.
 23 Dist. LEXIS 27380, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2017) (finding compelling reasons to seal
 24 “sensitive distribution agreement terms”); *Nextpulse v. Brunswick*, No. 22-cv-04071-HSG, 2023
 25 WL 1880949, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2023) (finding “compelling reasons to seal [asset
 26 purchase agreement because it comprises] confidential, strategic and competitively sensitive
 27 business information”); *Baird v. Blackrock Institutional Tr.*, 403 F. Supp. 3d 765, 792 (N.D. Cal.
 28

2019) (collecting cases and holding that “[c]ourts have found that ‘confidential business information’ in the form of ‘license agreements, financial terms, details of confidential licensing negotiations, and business strategies’ satisfies the ‘compelling reasons’ standard”); *see also Kyowa Hakko Kirin v. Aragen Bioscience*, No. 16-cv-05993-JD, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184566, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2017) (finding good cause to protect “confidential third-party information, the disclosure of which may violate confidentiality provisions in . . . agreements . . . and cause competitive and financial harm by allowing . . . competitors insight into . . . [business] strategies and efforts”).

The following materials sought to be sealed reflect highly confidential and sensitive information from an agreement with a third party subject to third-party confidentiality obligations. For example, the existence of the Agreement, its terms, and the identity of the third-party signatory—also reflected in the narrowly tailored portions of the Opposition, Ledahl Decl., and Ledahl Decl., Exh. 1 —comprise highly confidential and extremely sensitive information, the disclosure of which would cause competitive and financial harm to the agreement's signatories. (Mead Decl., ¶¶ 1-5.) Such information, if revealed to the public, could also be misused by competitors and adversaries to harm the signatories.

Table 1

Materials Sought to be Sealed	Sealing Request
<p>Opposition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • page 1, lines 19, 20, 21, 22, 24 • page 2, lines 2, 5, 15 • page 6, lines 7, 11, 15 • page 8, line 17 • page 10, lines 1, 2, 3, 6 • page 11, lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, fn. 5 (lines 27-28) • page 12, lines 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 24 	<p>Narrowly tailored portions of Opposition describing highly confidential and sensitive terms and the confidential signatory of the agreement</p>
<p>Ledahl Decl.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • page 2, line 26 	<p>Narrowly tailored portions of Ledahl Decl. describing highly confidential terms and the confidential identity of signatories to the agreement</p>

Table 1	
Materials Sought to be Sealed	Sealing Request
Ledahl Decl., Exh. 1	Narrowly tailored exhibit describing the confidential identity of signatories to the agreement

The narrowly tailored materials sought to be sealed reveal specific third-party signatories to the Agreement and highly confidential terms and business information subject to third-party confidentiality obligations. Given the injury that will result to Apple's business interests should this information be made public, a less restrictive alternative to sealing does not exist.

Compelling reasons and good cause exist to seal the narrowly tailored portions because public disclosure of that information would pose irreparable harm to the signatories to the Agreement and allow competitors and adversaries to gain an unfair competitive advantage or misuse the highly confidential information. *E.g., FTC v. Qualcomm*, No. 17-CV-00220-LHK, 2019 WL 95922, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2019) (granting sealing motion under the compelling reasons standard because the information may harm the party or third parties' "competitive standing and divulges terms of confidential contracts, contract negotiations ..."); *Ovonic Battery*, 2014 WL 3749152, at *3; *Open Text S.A.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177484, at *18, *35, *48; *GoPro Hong Kong*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27380, at *5; *Nextpulse*, 2023 WL 1880949, at *7.

III. COURT'S STANDING ORDER

Apple confirms that it has reviewed and complied with the Court's Standing Order Governing Administrative Motions to File Materials Under Seal and Civil Local Rule 79-5. Apple files this Motion cognizant of Para. 31 of the Standing Order and is prepared to file a more fulsome and revised motion to seal after the completion of briefing if warranted.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Apple respectfully requests that the Court grant an Order allowing Corephotonics to file under seal the materials identified in Table 1.

1 Dated: November 22, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

2 COOLEY LLP

3 By: /s/ Heidi L. Keefe
4 Heidi L. Keefe (178960)
(hkeefe@cooley.com)
5 Lowell Mead (223989)
(lmead@cooley.com)
6 Dena Chen (286452)
(dchen@cooley.com)
7 Matthew J. Brigham (191428)
(mbrigham@cooley.com)
8 Priya B. Viswanath (238089)
(pviswanath@cooley.com)
9 COOLEY LLP
10 3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, California 94304
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

12 COOLEY LLP
13 Phillip Morton (*Pro Hac Vice*)
(pmorton@cooley.com)
14 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue
NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004-2400
15 Telephone: (202) 842-7800
Facsimile: (202) 842-7899

16 *Attorneys for Defendant*
17 *Apple, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California. I am employed in Santa Clara County, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306. On the date set forth below I served the attached documents in the manner described below:

**1. DEFENDANT'S SUPPORT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**

(BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Cooley LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.

on the following part(ies) in this action:

Marc Fenster
Benjamin Wang
Brian D. Ledahl
Neil A. Rubin
James S. Tsuei
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (310) 826-7474
Facsimile: (310) 826-6991
mfenster@raklaw.com
bwang@raklaw.com
bledahl@raklaw.com
nrubin@raklaw.com
itsuei@raklaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Corephotonics, Ltd.

Executed on November 22, 2023, at Palo Alto, California.

/s/ Heidi L. Keefe

Heidi L. Keefe